

ILLEGIB

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010064-6

41/c

6-3-77

1. Can we make more effective our personnel recruitment process to insure the availability of the right talent, at the right time, and with the right mix of skills?

2. We need a more active counseling and assessment effort to insure departures of misfits before the end of the probation period.

3. We need to insure the effective performance of those supervisors entrusted with the responsibility for the training and orientation of the new employee.

4. We need to insure the most equitable possible system for the skill-enhancement, promotion and career development of our employees without regard to race or sex. Is this best done impersonally, by boards or personally by Chiefs?

5. How do we enhance career prospects for the minorities, including women? Are we adequately arranging for training and advancement from clerical or blue-collar tasks to professional positions?

6. Since all intelligence community components, including CIA, are sharpening their planning for future substantive developments, to what extent can we project needs for personnel skills out 10 years or so? Should not we be alerting our employees now to the skills we foresee as necessary so that they can do a better job of planning their own careers?

7. We need to be able to make informed judgments about supervisory potentials before promoting employees to supervisory positions. We must provide paths to very senior grades and positions for employees who are expert in special skills but may have no flair for supervision.

8. We need a system in which Agency-wide job vacancies are in a clear and timely way made available to any or all employees upon request. We need to consider, too, an automated system for matching the skills of individuals to the requirements of a given position. (In this respect, we should insure that our job descriptions are adequately precise.)

9. How do we decide on those jobs to be filled by lateral entry in order to meet demands for special skills or to provide for a "leavening" through introduction of outside talent?

10. Have we made the right decisions with regard to insuring a strong and supported job classification system?

11. We need to consider deciding on a more active program to separate those consistently ranked in the bottom two or three percent of their career services.

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010064-6

Administrative - Internal Use Only

ILLEGIB

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010064-6

Administrative - Internal Use Only

J7 questions
PW
TS

ILLEGIB

12. We need to consider an "up-or-out" policy under which middle-level grades, say GS-11 to GS-14, would leave early if not promoted in a certain length of time.

13. In recognition of growing lack of headroom and opportunity in senior grades (GS-15 to GS-18), we need to rank current incumbents of these grades, and develop criteria for seeking early retirement or other such solutions to the headroom problem. ^{How EFFECTIVE?}

14. Having agreed in EAG on the 38 jobs we identified as key assignments to be made on Agency-wide considerations, how can we insure a process to accomplish this is in train?

15. Is the Office of Personnel properly placed in CIA to develop new and creative personnel policy and execute it too? Is too much authority for the handling of personnel matters delegated to operating components. Should more authority be invested centrally? Should there be a separation of personnel policy development and personnel actions? Recognizing the growing importance of training in keeping our personnel an courant and professionally competent, should personnel and training responsibilities be combined organizationally to any extent?

DEFER

ILLEGIB

ADD

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900010064-6

Administrative - Internal Use Only

KNOCHE's NOTES

Item 6:

Before we get into 10 year projections of personnel requirements, we better improve our short-term projects. One of our current MBO's is to monitor the accuracy of this fiscal year's personnel requirements forecast. So far, 75% of the offices are 50% or more in error on their forecasts.

On the other hand, I believe it would be useful to have closer coordination with ICS and the Comptroller's Office on their predictions and budgets for five years in advance. If, for example, S&T is going to have a project requiring some new academic discipline in 1981, we ought to know this as early as possible so that we can find sources of this discipline.

Item 14:

Directorates have provided the additional information requested by the EAG on the key assignment jobs. This information is being reviewed by directorates to see if they wish to change their list of nominees. The revised list will be presented to EAG in a mid-July meeting. After selections are approved, OP could monitor the results and present a report to the EAG, perhaps semi-annually, or at least annually.